DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 477 SP 032 730

AUTHOR Scannell, Marilyn M.
TITLE Roles and Authority of States in Policies for Teachers and Teaching. Trends and Issues Paper No. 2.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89333-076-0
PUB DATE Nov 90
CONTRACT RI88062015
NOTE 40p.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-2450 ($12.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Alternative Teacher Certification; *Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Government Role; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; *Policy Formation; Preservice Teacher Education; State Legislation; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Supply and Demand; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

This paper highlights recent trends, issues, and research related to the roles and authority of states in policies for teachers and teaching. A review of literature demonstrates an increased role for state policymakers in education decision making. Decisions that had typically been within the domain of professional educators are now subject to state mandate. Trends, however, suggest that state policymakers will focus their attention more on educational outcomes and accountability systems and less on prescribing how education should be delivered, thus making the role of local institutions increasingly important. While there is major agreement between educators and policymakers that systemic changes in the education system are necessary, in contrast to the surface changes of earlier reform mandates, there is substantial disagreement on how such change will be achieved. Many policy analysts advocate a capacity-building approach to effecting changes in the education delivery system. Many state policymakers are looking at system-changing policies rather than capacity-building strategies as the best method for effecting change; e.g., the advocacy of alternative teacher certification programs that bypass traditional education programs entirely. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325477

ERIC

ROLES AND AUTHORITY OF STATES IN POLICIES FOR TEACHERS AND TEACHING

Marilyn M. Scannell
University of Maryland-College Park

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Imig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle ♦ Suite 610 ♦ Washington, DC 20036

SP 032 730

TRENDS AND ISSUES PAPER • NO. 2

ROLES AND AUTHORITY OF STATES IN POLICIES FOR TEACHERS AND TEACHING

Marilyn M. Scannell
University of Maryland-College Park

Published by
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle • Suite 610 • Washington, DC 20036-2412
November 1990

CITE AS:
Scannell, M. M. (1990). *Roles and authority of states in policies for teachers and teaching*. (Trends and Issues Paper No. 2). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

MANUSCRIPTS:
The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education invites individuals to submit proposals for writing Trends and Issues Papers. Proposals should include:

1. A detailed manuscript proposal of not more than five pages.
2. A vita.
3. A writing sample.

PREPAID ORDERS:
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-2412
(202) 293-2450
$12.00

ISBN 0-89333-076-0

Series Editor: Mary E. Dilworth

OERI
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number RI 88062015. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or DOE.

ROLES AND AUTHORITY OF STATES IN POLICIES FOR TEACHERS AND TEACHING

Introduction

Even the most casual observer is likely to be aware of the increase in activity at the state level with regard to regulations focusing on the nature and conduct of education in our nation's schools. Although state involvement in the educational policy-making arena is not a new phenomenon, what is striking is the number of new policies enacted by state policymakers across the country during the past decade. Reporting on state education reform initiatives in 1986, then Education Secretary Bell noted: 41 states had raised high school graduation requirements; 33 had initiated student competency test requirements; 30 required teacher competency tests; and 24 had initiated career ladder programs for teachers (Clark and Astuto, 1988, p. 11).

Turning specifically to activity in the realm of teacher policy, Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) state:

> During the 1980s virtually every state enacted legislation to reform teacher education licensing and compensation . . . over 1,000 pieces of legislation regarding teachers have been developed over the course of a decade . . .(p. v).

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1988) reports that 45 states have legislative mandates, or active programs, requiring written exams prior to initial licensure for teaching; 38 states have scholarship, loan, and/or fellowship programs to lure new entrants into teacher preparation programs; 40 states have instituted a uniform program or guidelines for local initiatives for beginning teacher induction into the work-force; 30 states have specific incentives to recruit minorities into the teaching occupation; and two states—Texas and Virginia—have legislated a maximum number of hours of professional education that may be included in teacher preparation programs (p. i).

The data convincingly indicate that the role of the state in educational policy-making generally, and specifically with regard to teachers and teach-

ing, has changed dramatically. Although educational matters related to teachers and teaching always have been within the purview of state-level policymakers, decisions prior to the last decade had been largely delegated to the educational establishment and local school systems. Now, as Clark and Astuto (1988) note, the "locus of action on educational policy is in state capitals where it will remain for an indefinite period of time" (p. 13).

Not only is the action at the state rather than the local level, but according to Scannell (1988), educational decisions are no longer primarily in the hands of the educational interest groups. These decisions have become increasingly politicized with the development of executive and legislative expertise on educational issues (p. 220). As Finn (1987) states, what has occurred during the past few years is that state officials have begun to "realign the balance of power and authority in education policy-making" (p. 310). Governors, state legislators, state education departments, state and local school boards, organizations representing teachers and school administrators, and teacher educators are all "vying with one another over educational policy" (Timar and Kirp, 1988, p. 111).

Sizer (Timar and Kirp, 1988) believes that the educational policies enacted at the state level during the 1980s, developed largely without the input of educational interest groups, will profoundly change schools and "the way that the public and particularly the professionals and students perceive their tasks to be" (p. x). For this reason, it is vitally important to understand what has occurred with education in the states, why so many changes have taken place so quickly; what their impact has been, the resultant issues regarding their efficacy, and future trends.

The purpose of this document is to summarize the literature with respect to recent trends, issues, and research highlights related to the role of the state in policies affecting teachers and teaching. This paper will consist of a review of recent literature organized according to the following topics: the evolution of the state role in educational policy-making from the 1960s to the present; the forces behind the changing state role in educational policy-making; the impact of state policies on teachers and teaching; alternative policy strategies for effecting changes in teachers and teaching; critical issues to be considered by state policymakers in future policies focusing on teachers and teaching; and for the future role of the state in educational policy-making.

The Evolution of the State Role in Educational Policy-making

The past three decades have witnessed three major shifts in the locus of educational decision making. According to Timar and Kirp (1988), the Supreme Court's 1954 decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* changed the locus of much educational decision making from a local level dominated by school boards and professionals to federal and state levels. With the advent of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education) in 1983, continue Timar and Kirp, came a second shift in the locus of educational decision making. That report advocated a reduced federal role in educational issues and a "conviction that schooling is essentially a state and local matter . . ." (p. 1).

According to Darling-Hammond (1988b), in 1986 a second wave of reform reports advocated a third shift in educational decision making—from the centralized, highly regulated approach currently taken by state policymakers to one characterized by decentralized decision making by educational professionals at local levels. This third phase, advocating a return to local and professional control, will be discussed later in this review.

Important to note, however, according to Timar and Kirp (1988), is that while there was a shift in decision-making levels during the 1980s, the strategies—regulatory mechanisms and strict compliance—did not change from those used at the federal levels during previous decades (p. 3). While their observation may accurately describe policy-making strategies prior to 1986, with the "second wave of reform reports," referred to above, a broader range of policy instruments has emerged.

In their analysis of recent educational reforms, McDonnell and Elmore (1987) identify four classes of policy instruments or mechanisms used to achieve policy-making goals:

> **mandates**—are rules governing the action of individuals and agencies, and are intended to produce compliance;
>
> **inducements**—transfer money to individuals or agencies in return for certain actions;

capacity building—is the transfer of money for the purpose of investment in material, intellectual, or human resources; and

system changing—transfers official authority among individuals and agencies in order to alter the system by which public goods and services are delivered (p. 134).

Important to note, according to the authors, are the different assumptions associated with the various policy instruments. Associated with both the mandates and inducements strategies is an assumption that the desired capacity exists and that what is needed is a way to ensure that the goals are attained. With the capacity building and system changing strategies, on the other hand, policymakers acknowledge that the capacity does not exist to produce the desired result within existing institutions and that more complex policy instruments must be used to reach the desired goal. McDonnell and Elmore caution policymakers, however, that capacity building is not an instrument that brings short-term results, and that system-changing policies introduce a new set of problems for policymakers (pp. 143-44).

While a review of recent state-level actions noted in the report of the National Governors' Association, *Results in Education: 1989*, reveals many policies still fall within the mandates classification, an increasing number can be classified as inducement policies. Additionally, the number of policies that can be characterized as capacity building and system changing in nature is growing. The following sample of state-level policy actions cited as "Highlights of State Education Policies 1988-89" in the governors' 1989 report (pp. 58-69) are classified into policy instruments according to McDonnell's and Elmore's (1987) typology (Note: some policies could fit into more than one typology depending on how the policy is implemented in a particular state):

mandates—teacher testing and assessment programs, new licensure standards, new teacher education program approval standards, on-the-job performance appraisal systems, recertification requirements;

inducements— fellowships/scholarships, minimum salary compensation levels/statewide salary schedules, loan forgiveness programs, urban teacher retention projects, teacher recognition programs, career ladders/differentiated staffing, merit and performance-based pay;

capacity building policies— teacher academies, five-year teacher preparation programs/master of teaching degrees, beginning teacher induction programs/internships, clinical schools, peer coaching/mentoring, cooperating teacher programs;

system changing policies—career teacher programs, paraprofessional training/associate degree programs, alternative and provisional certification programs, professional standards boards for teachers.

In summary, the literature review has portrayed an increased role for state policymakers in policies affecting teachers and teaching since the 1970s. Recent trends indicate, however, that there has been some return of power to the local decision-making levels. Furthermore, while mandates comprised the vast majority of state-level policies from the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s, recently, alternative policy instruments have been used by state policymakers to effect desired changes in teachers and teaching.

The next two sections of this paper review the literature associated with state policies prior to 1986, while the remaining sections incorporate the literature associated with policies and policy-making trends since that time. In the following section the forces behind the change in state-level policy-making for teachers and teaching are examined. The literature will be reviewed to determine the major social, political, and economic forces that led to an increased role for state policymakers.

Forces Leading to a Change in States' Role in Educational Policy-making

The assumption of greater control of educational decisions by state-level policymakers resulted from a convergence of factors. On the one hand, traditions of local control of educational decision making and separation of education from politics were dying. On the other, the general perception that the nation's schools were educationally bankrupt necessitated that policymakers take immediate steps to reassure the public that this situation would be corrected.

Changing Traditions

Finn (1987) describes two traditions that had kept state officials out of educational policy-making until recently—the tradition of local control and the belief that education should be "above politics" (p. 305). A number of factors contributed to the weakening of local autonomy in educational policy-making. One factor, according to Scannell (1988), was the inability of the local education agencies to cope with unprecedented numbers of immigrant poor and minority children entering the public schools "as a result of the nation's concerted commitment to educational equity in the 1960s" (p. 4). Because the local education agencies were not prepared, equipped, or financed to handle this job effectively, state agencies intervened with funds and accompanying regulations.

Coinciding with the increased demands on the schools, was the demise of a once-powerful coalition of local educational interest groups. This situation created a void in local leadership and a decline in the influence of local control advocates. Bailey, Frost, March, and Wood (Scannell, 1988) found that "growing teacher militancy was affecting the relationships among teacher groups and administrator and school board groups" (p. 75). As predicted by Milstein and Jennings (Scannell, 1988), this "internecine warfare" refocused "much of the energy of these interest groups, creating a situation whereby the legislature and governor . . . play more dominant roles" (p. 75).

According to Finn (1987), by the 1970s when public opinion of the nation's schools was becoming increasingly negative, state policymakers were ready to regulate change. Several conditions lead to this state of readiness, including the growth in capacity of state governmental agencies due largely to the need to administer federal programs beginning in the 1960s; the growth in state spending for education; and the need to respond to a public demanding change. Concurrent with the belief that state policymakers had the capacity and will to "tackle the tough education issues" (p. 307) was a growing belief that the educational establishment was unwilling to change because change might challenge the power bases of vested interest groups (Scannell, 1988, p. 57).

In addition to diminished local capacity, the public perception of how educational decisions should be made was changing, according to Finn (1987). Education was no longer an apolitical topic, he states. In fact, the

public's perception was that educational decisions had come to be dominated by educational interest groups who were serving their own interests, not that of the public. Finn cites the following quote from Koerner in *Who Controls American Education?* as an example of the public's growing distrust of professional educational administrators: "the expert's knowledge is not good enough for the rest of us to leave the policy decisions to him [sic], not nearly good enough" (p. 310). Wise, Darling-Hammond, and Purnell (1988) also cite the desire for fundamental shifts in the politics of controlling the teaching profession as a reason for recent policy changes in that arena.

Economic Concerns, National Reports, and Public Opinion

Finn (1987) cites three reasons why state policymakers acted so quickly and convincingly given the chance to do so: the link between economic growth and the educational system, the pressures of national reports citing the dismal condition of America's schools and schooling, and the public's belief that the situation was urgent (p. 311). Clark and Astuto (1988) corroborate Finn's assertion that the public believed that America's economy was losing ground to international competitors. In addition, Scannell (1988) and Krotseng (1988) describe the desire of policymakers in the southern region of the country to improve their states' economic standings through improvements in their educational systems.

Public concerns regarding the failing educational system were given voice in and exacerbated by national reports, best illustrated by *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). That document gave prominent coverage to the Reagan administration's focus on a new educational priority—excellence, as measured by student achievement at particular grade levels. According to Clark and Astuto (1988), the Reagan administration "has altered the priority placed on equity and redirected the concern of the public and policymakers to excellence, standards of performance and individual competition" (p. 14).

Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) also credit *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) with capturing the public's attention about the malaise of the country's educational system. Educational shortcomings cited in the report included: the graduation of functional illiterates from high school; the inability of students to use higher-order thinking skills; declining scores on student achievement tests and in science, and the low scores of American students compared with those from other countries. According to Darling-Hammond and Berry, the

national report argued that reversing these disturbing trends necessitated attracting and retaining "those bright and creative teachers who themselves possess the capacities desired for students" (p.3).

Reports of low test scores of prospective teachers, easy entry into teacher education programs, lack of rigor and relevance of those programs, and the like, according to Schalock and Myton (1988), made it evident to governors, legislators, and other state officials that changes in policies for entry to teaching should be made. In *Time for Results* (National Governors' Association, 1986), the governors' perceptions are summarized. That report cites a "quantity and quality" problem in the teacher work force. It goes on to state that "figures show that by 1991 supply will only be 68 percent of the demand" for new teachers. In addition, according to the report, "Teachers score below other college graduates on most standardized tests," and "Those who score high on those tests tend to leave the classroom earlier than others, while those who score the lowest tend to remain" (p. 31). The report concludes by saying that "governors have a special opportunity now to strengthen teaching," by forcing "standards in the right direction" and making "teaching more attractive" (p. 32). As described throughout this review, in most states governors and other state officials have taken advantage of this "opportunity" by enacting a myriad of policies focused on regulating schools and teaching.

A phenomenon resulting from the increased involvement of powerful governors in educational issues, according to Spring (1988), is the nationalization of state policies. This phenomenon, Spring says, has been accomplished through the activities of several nongovernmental organizations that have served as "forums for the discussion of educational policies and for the coordination of state educational efforts" (p. 79). Spring cites the work of three organizations—the National Governors' Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the Education Commission of the States—as examples of this nationalizing influence.

In addition, according to Spring, foundations have "recruited educationally active governors to serve on task forces" (p. 79). "Concern with reforming the teaching profession" linked the National Governors' Association with the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Spring notes. The Corporation awarded $890,000 to the National Governors' Association for the purpose of working with states to change their teacher training and certification laws. The intent, according to Spring, was to persuade states "to conform to the

recommendations of [the Corporation's] task force report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*" (p. 82).

The Impact of the Increased State Role in Educational Policy-making

A review of the literature on state roles and authority in teacher education would be incomplete if it consisted only of a description of the changed nature of that role without also reviewing the perceived impact of state-level reform policies. Timar and Kirp (1988) note that the increased state role has had a tremendous impact on who is involved in decision making. These new educational stakeholders in turn have changed the nature of the decision-making process, which in turn has altered the focus of educational reform strategies.

One consequence of moving educational decision making to the state level, the authors note, has been that states have adopted similar approaches to educational reform. Timar and Kirp (1988) found that a "common definition of the problem of mediocrity and common political solutions have resulted in homogenizing educational policies nationally" (p. 112). A negative consequence of limiting local discretion by promoting uniformity and standardization, they caution, is the "narrowing of educational objectives" leading to a "reduction of learning to rote, standardization, basics, and test scores" (p. 116). Reiterating this concern, Clark and Astuto (1988) worry that the "flow of new knowledge into, and experimentation in, America's schools will be replaced by an effort to respond to the pressure of higher scores on achievement tests" (p. 26). This concern has prompted many states to develop performance-based assessments as part of their testing programs. The California Assessment Program, for example, focuses on students' abilities to perform tasks rather than on their proficiency at taking multiple-choice tests.

Another consequence of increased state-level control of educational policy-making, Timar and Kirp (1988) note, is greater influence of business and industry in educational decision making. In some states the authors studied, "educational reform became a test of political strength between newly formed business coalitions, on the one hand, and entrenched educational coalitions on the other." The entrance of these new groups into the

educational policy arena has enormous potential to influence how schools will be managed and what the curriculum will emphasize. This trend has been reinforced at the national level where business and industry has had a significant voice in education reform initiatives that focus on the interdependence of education and the nation's economy.

The changing state role has also politicized educators, Timar and Kirp (1988) found. Educational decisions are now the result of influence brokering between the various educational stakeholder groups. Some believe that expanding the number of stakeholders involved in educational policy-making will facilitate educational reform. Others contend that educational decisions made for political reasons will result in reforms that are primarily of a symbolic nature (Scannell, 1988, p. 206).

The final consequence of the growth of the state's role in educational policy-making noted by Timar and Kirp (1988) is the increased bureaucratization of the educational system. The authors found new state structures, more departments in state education agencies, more people administering the implementation of new rules and regulations, new tests, and "monitors monitoring the monitors" (p. 114). The authors leave the reader questioning whether these policy-making outcomes were purposeful on the part of policymakers or unanticipated (and perhaps unwanted) consequences of the new state role.

Unanticipated Consequences for Teacher Policies as Well?

Scannell (1988), Wise et al. (1988), and Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) note that state-level changes in standards for entry to teaching have had undesirable, even conflicting, results in some states. Four of the most often cited undesirable policy consequences, which have required states to alter earlier approaches to teacher education reform, are described below.

Screens without Magnets—While the stated intent of policymakers when reforming standards for entry to teaching was to attract the best and brightest into the teaching occupation, some policy analysts assert that the new screens have demeaned the profession, thus discouraging new potential entrants. Wise et al. (1988) point out that instituting new policies to screen out some candidates without simultaneously taking steps to lure "more able entrants" may result in the desired applicants choosing "more lucrative fields marked by less 'bureaucratic harassment'" (p. 9).

Backdoor Entry—Scannell (1988) found that many states that had raised their formal standards for entry to teaching also had the most permissive policies for allowing individuals to teach with emergency certificates. Wise et al. (1988) also question whether new testing requirements for prospective teachers have achieved the improvements desired. They note specifically those states that have compensated for shortages resulting from testing by implementing alternative certification routes and increasing the use of emergency certification.

Changed Composition of the Teaching Force—In addition to reducing the numbers of prospective teachers, testing policies have had a profound effect on the nature of those entering the teacher work force. Black candidates have been screened out in disproportionate numbers; more teachers are White and female than prior to enactment of the new policies. In Florida, for example, while there was a 25 percent decline in admissions to teacher education programs overall, there was a 90 percent decline in minority admissions (Wise et al. 1988, p. 28). In some states where teacher education program approval has been tied to the number of graduates passing teacher competency tests, predominately Black schools have felt the most negative impact. The severely diminished pool of minority teacher candidates would likely be cited by most policy analysts as the most undesirable and least carefully addressed consequence of teacher reforms to date. As indicated in the introduction, many states are now taking belated steps to reverse this trend; however, the damage will not be easily corrected.

Lack of Involvement by Educators—Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) state that professional educators were excluded from the policy-making process for the first wave of educational reforms because policymakers believed the profession could not reform itself. As a result, the two sides have been in opposition, not cooperation, a situation that has retarded the progress of the educational reform movement.

Another sign of the lack of educator involvement in state policies to reform the teaching profession, according to Scannell (1988), is that standards for entry into teaching vary greatly across the states and are not consistently applied even within the same state. This inconsistency reflects policymakers' inability to reach consensus about the knowledge and skills needed to be an effective teacher. Scannell concluded that as a result, claims of higher standards for entry into teaching are more symbolic than substantive in nature (pp. 171-72).

In spite of the above-cited negative effects of recent state-level reform efforts, many policy analysts would agree with Timar and Kirp (1988) that there have been positive outcomes as well. These authors cite several state-specific examples, including improved student attendance levels, special academies for academically able students, increases in school resources, and fewer ineligible football players because of failing grades (pp. 113-14). However, there is also a sense that the reforms of the 1980s have not achieved all that was promised.

According to Clark and Astuto (1988), the teacher work force still suffers from a decline in teacher morale, diminished quality of new entrants, and diminished representation from an "expanding underclass." The 1986 report of the National Governors' Association, *Time for Results*, also concludes that state reforms have made schools even more bureaucratic, and that by specifying local action in ever greater detail, reforms have "dampened local commitment" (p. 37). A 1989 report, *Results in Education*, issued by the National Governors' Association also points out that recent studies indicate that policies raising standards for teaching have had "marginal impact on actual quality of classroom instruction" (National Governors' Association, 1989, p. 20). Boyer (Futrell, 1989) states that the "wave of regulatory intervention was 'destroying the spirit of the people in the classroom'" (p. 10). In addition, according to Boyer, school reform was "failing in the inner city" (p. 12).

While some might assert that the reform movement has failed, Firestone, Fuhrman, and Kirst (1989), state that on the basis of their research, such a conclusion is "overly harsh." They conclude that the reforms "have produced modest change in the direction of goals expressed in [*A Nation At Risk*] 1983" (p.16). In their study, which examines reform measures in six states, the authors found most reforms were regulatory in nature, e.g., changes in testing and graduation requirements, teacher certification and compensation. However, they found as well that steps had begun in the direction of capacity building and a professional orientation to reform, especially at local district levels, e.g., school restructuring and mentor teacher initiatives. Such findings lead the authors to suggest that the "reform policies of the 1980s do represent first steps in a long-term improvement process" (p. 51).

In response to the negative consequences of earlier reform efforts and the still unsolved problems of America's educational system, a second wave of reform efforts began in the latter part of the 1980s. These reforms,

in contrast to the first wave, have focused on the need to increase teacher professionalism and school-based management. The central thesis for the new movement calls for greater autonomy for teachers and schools in exchange for greater accountability for the results of their actions. The next section reviews the second wave of educational reforms centering on the concurrent growth of these two trends—teacher professionalism and professional accountability.

Alternative Policy Strategies for Effecting Changes in Teachers and Teaching: Building Capacity and Changing the System

In their 1986 report, *Time for Results* (National Governors' Association), the governors acknowledged that the first round of reform efforts fell short of making the kinds of organizational changes needed to recruit and keep the kind of teachers desired and effectively to use their talents (p. 32). In order to accomplish those objectives, according to policy analysts interviewed by the governors' Task Force on Teaching, there must be a second round of reform efforts. Such reforms would focus on a major restructuring of the teaching occupation and a rethinking of the role of the teacher (Task Force on Teaching, 1986, p. 15). The governors' report goes on to set forth the agenda for professionalizing the teaching occupation—an agenda for which they see themselves providing the leadership:

- define the body of professional knowledge and practice that teachers must have,
- create a national board to define teacher standards,
- rebuild teacher education,
- redesign the organization of schools to create more productive working and learning environments,
- recruit able teacher candidates—all teachers should have to meet the same standards,
- improve teacher compensation,
- align teacher incentives with schoolwide student performance, and

- improve teacher mobility (National Governors' Association, 1986, pp. 38-40).

Important to note in the above agenda are the number of capacity-building and system-changing policy strategies identified by the governors, using the typology developed by McDonnell and Elmore (1987).

According to Devaney and Sykes (1988), the governors' support for professionalizing teaching is driven primarily by the desire to "recruit and retain the best and the brightest." Professionalization, according to this argument say Devany and Sykes, would bring higher entry salaries, "prospects for higher career-long earnings, enlarged responsibility, and greater variety of work . . . needed in order to attract and retain able people into teaching" (p. 4).

These authors argue, however, that more than "professional trappings" are needed:

> The case must be made to politicians and bureaucrats and taxpayers that schooling requires a professional *culture*— . . .professionalism on the part of *all* teachers, not just on the part of an elite cadre; and that this professionalism is needed for the sake of students' learning, not just for the sake of attracting people into teaching (p. 9).

Professionalism, according to Sykes (1987) involves a "social contract established between an occupation providing a public service and the public itself as represented by various elected and appointed officials" (p. 19):

> One such contract involves the exchange of autonomy for obligation. A profession agrees to develop and enforce standards of good practice in exchange for the right to practice free of bureaucratic supervision and external regulation. At the policy level, this contract applies to standards for licensure, certification, and program accreditation. The state delegates substantial responsibility for such standards to organizations that represent the occupation. At the practice level, this contract applies to the organization and management of work. Collegial norms and peer evaluation direct work that is

> amenable neither to administrative oversight nor to routinization (p. 19).

State v. Professional Standard Setting

The idea of professionalizing the teacher work force as a solution to problems in American education is not a new one. According to Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988), with each educational reform movement since the early 1900s, the "notion was advanced that professionalization of teaching is linked to provision of universal high-quality education." However, the authors state, each time the method chosen to solve educational problems was greater standardization and increased regulation rather than professionalization (p. vi). The "consequence" of this choice, according to Sykes (1987), is to reduce teacher autonomy and to discourage development of judgment (p. 20).

The current reform movement once again centers on who regulates what aspects of the educational system. Darling-Hammond (1988a) argues that, in light of the failures of past attempts to reform the educational system, it is time to substitute professional accountability for bureaucratic accountability in education. According to Darling-Hammond, state and local policymakers must maintain a role to "ensure fairness in the delivery of educational services" and to provide accountability to those within their jurisdictions. However, she maintains, that role should be limited to solving "problems of inequity in operating the educational system," not solving productivity questions (pp. 41-42).

Past attempts to reform education have failed, according to Darling-Hammond (1988a), largely because "policy decisions about methods of teaching and schooling processes cannot ever meet the demands of varying school and student circumstances" (p. 4). Darling-Hammond (1988a) continues:

> Professional accountability assumes that, since teaching work is too complex to be hierarchically prescribed and controlled, it must be structured so that practitioners can make responsible decisions, both individually and collectively. Accountability is provided by rigorous training and careful selection, serious and sustained internships for beginners, meaningful evaluation, opportunities for professional learning, and ongoing review of practice (p. 42).

The proper role for the state vis a vis teacher policies, suggest Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988), is in ensuring proper regulation of teachers such that the process of teaching can be deregulated. Because practice cannot be standardized, Darling-Hammond (1988b) maintains, there must be standards of practice that require that all individuals permitted to practice be adequately prepared according to the current knowledge about teaching and learning and able to continually search for the most responsible course of action as knowledge about teaching and learning expands. These standards cannot be achieved by prescription, she continues, but rather by "socialization to a professional standard that incorporates continual learning, reflection, and concern with the multiple effects of one's actions on others . . ." (p. 67).

According to Sykes (1987):

> Critics of professionalism raise three value issues . . . . First, they question whether the hunger for a technical knowledge base will erode concern for caring and compassion in the human services . . . .
>
> A second criticism associates professionalism with the attempt to create social distance between the professional and the client, a move likely to undercut the democratic ideals of schooling. . . .
>
> Finally, professionalism may be incompatible with equity goals . . . [by driving] women, immigrants, and minorities out of the ranks (p. 21).

While acknowledging the legitimacy of these criticisms, Sykes maintains that the argument for professionalizing the teaching occupation is so compelling that steps must be taken to avoid the paths pursued by other professions. He states:

> As educators seek to learn the lessons of the past and to study the other professions for leads to advancement, they must attend to the basic values of their own enterprise and forge a professionalism distinctively suited to such ideals (p. 21).

Even if state policymakers were to accept the premise that their proper role with respect to teacher policy is to ensure regulation of teachers, not teaching, a host of issues remain. How should entering teachers be regulated? Should the nature of the standards for entering teaching determine the nature of the teacher training program and the nature of the assessment(s) used to evaluate whether or not a teacher is adequately prepared to enter the teacher work force? Literature discussing these and other issues remaining to be resolved by educators and state policymakers will be highlighted in the following section.

Critical Issues Related to the State's Role in Teacher-related Policy Matters

Shive (1988) cites four critical issues facing the teaching profession:

1. the nature and content of the teacher preparation program,
2. the nature of the assessment for entry into the teaching profession,
3. solutions to the supply/demand problem that do not require lowering standards in times of teacher shortage, and
4. ensuring that sufficient numbers of minority teachers enter the work force.

He advocates professional practices boards for teaching as the best approach to resolving these and other issues facing the teaching profession. These topics and national trends influencing the state policy climate will be discussed in the following pages.

Teacher Preparation

Darling-Hammond (1989), questions whether state policymakers are fulfilling their role of ensuring that "all individuals permitted to practice [teaching] are adequately prepared" (p. 66). She bases her uncertainty on policies in 46 states permitting emergency certification of teachers and in 33 states allowing alternative certification routes. Additionally, 2 states, Virginia and Texas, have mandated that a ceiling be placed on the number of

education courses required of prospective teachers. [Simms and Miller (1988) provide a full description of the Texas law limiting pedagogical coursework.]

Darling-Hammond (1989) maintains that such policies "fundamentally undermine the presumption that all professionals holding the same office will share common knowledge and commitments" (p. 67). Further, according to Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988), these policies indicate that, in spite of the major changes in teacher preparation and certification over the past decade, there is still no common perception of what a prospective teacher should know and be able to do. They question whether this is an issue that can or should be decided by state policymakers, or one that would more appropriately be decided by teacher educators.

The states' role in regulating teacher education programs during the past decade is contrary to the way most other professions are regulated, according to Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988). For other professions, state regulations specify the outcome standards expected of professionals and allow professional schools to determine how they may best be met (p. vii). By decreasing the pedagogical content of teacher preparation programs, the authors continue, policymakers are disputing claims to a specialized knowledge base for teaching. Such policies, Zeichner (1988) maintains, "may not only fail to solve the problems they were intended to address but may in fact lead to the creation of new problems that will undermine the academic and professional quality of teacher education programs" (p. 34).

The efforts of organizations such as the Holmes Group (a group of education deans representing research institutions), the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the National Network for Educational Renewal (initiated by John Goodlad), represent a totally different approach to redefining teacher preparation programs, licensure, and certification standards. According to the governors' report, *Results in Education: 1989*, "twenty states joined with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) to raise state standards by instituting a system for colleges and universities to receive simultaneous state program approval and national accreditation" (p. 16). Among the revised NCATE standards for accrediting teacher preparing institutions, made operational in 1988, are requirements that the institution demonstrate linkages between professional preparation programs and school practices

and use educational research findings as the base for the program curricula, instruction, and practices.

The 1986 Holmes Group report, *Tomorrow's Teachers*, advocates teacher preparation programs that "guarantee the student's mastery" of general and liberal education, the subject matter of the teaching field, the literature of education, and reflective practical experience. According to Murray (1986), such an undertaking takes "more time than is currently available in the traditional four-year undergraduate program," necessitating the reorganization and extension of the traditional program (p. 30). Under the Holmes Group design, a student would master liberal education and the teaching field subject matter as an undergraduate, and pursue pedagogical studies at the graduate level. Likewise the 1986 Carnegie report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, recommends "the abolition of the undergraduate major in education, and the creation of Master in Teaching degree programs for professional teacher education" (Tucker and Mandel, 1986, p. 24).

In *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990), another aspect of the Holmes Group's program is amplified— the professional development school that would bring practicing teachers and administrators together with university faculty members for the purpose of designing new school structures and forms of practice to meet the needs of children with different backgrounds, abilities, and learning styles. As part of his national network and research efforts, Goodlad (1988) also calls for school districts and universities to come together in a partnership endeavor for the purpose of "simultaneously renewing schools and programs for the education of educators" (p. 11).

Determining the nature of teacher preparation programs and defining what an adequately prepared teacher should know and be able to do is related to a second issue. That issue is, how should teacher candidates be assessed to determine whether in fact they are fit to practice?

Teacher Assessment

According to Kirst (Task Force on Teaching, 1986), "measuring educational outcomes . . . is one of the most serious challenges facing the reform movement today, and almost no state has devoted the resources necessary to mount such complex evaluations" (p. 29). Many policy analysts believe this assertion to be true for determining how teachers should be trained and evaluated as well.

The practice of testing prospective teachers prior to entry to training programs and prior to beginning practice is commonplace. Testing policies are having a substantial impact on the supply of prospective teachers and the composition of the teacher work force by creating teacher shortages and reducing the numbers of minority individuals entering teaching. Considering these substantial social costs, an issue to be resolved is whether current policies are achieving the policymakers' stated objective of raising the public's respect for the profession.

Policymakers have maintained that testing, by screening out unqualified individuals, would strengthen the teaching profession and attract better qualified candidates. As a result, public confidence in teachers, teaching, and schools is expected to improve. "In order to meet these goals," Eissenberg and Rudner (1988) argue, "there must be a sufficient supply of prospective teachers, the test must measure appropriate content, and test standards must be sufficiently high" (p. 1).

Eissenberg and Rudner (1988) examine whether the current teacher testing program establishes meaningful standards by looking at passing scores in 14 states using the NTE in 1987 to determine entry to the teacher work force. They found the established passing scores to be so low that there was an 80 percent chance of accepting "a marginally unqualified student" (p. 6). The number of items needed to be answered correctly, they state, was not much higher than the number that would be correctly answered by chance. As a result of these findings, they raise the question: "With virtually anyone passing, are these current programs worth the time, expense, and aggravation they incur?" (p. 8).

Other policy analysts support Eissenberg's and Rudner's (1988) doubts regarding the efficacy of current testing policies. For example, Goertz, Coley, and Edstrom (National Governors' Association, 1986) found that ". . .teacher policies were put into place without regard for supply and demand" necessitating reduced test score cutoffs when not enough teachers are recruited. The authors found that states were expending all of their efforts on screening out the "underqualified" rather than efforts to develop people who might become qualified (p. 36).

Ellwein, Glass, and Smith (1988) concluded from their case studies that rather than improving the quality of entrants to the teaching profession,

testing reforms were primarily symbolic in nature. They base their conclusions on the following observations:

1. Anticipated failure rates influence standards when agencies must deal firsthand with testing consequences.

2. As standards are erected, safety nets are strung to catch those who fall.

3. Organizational efforts are most visible, intense, and de tailed during the early phases of competency testing re forms. Similar efforts are conspicuously absent in later stages.

4. Agency attention to minority issues is most prominent in efforts to build unbiased tests and most inconspicuous in efforts to assess adverse impact (pp.5-7).

Scannell's research (1988) also led to the conclusion that through the competency assessment movement, "Policymakers . . . have enacted an incomplete set of quick-fix and relatively inexpensive policies in an effort to placate the public and attract new business and industry." She bases her conclusions on low levels of funding for education in states with the highest levels of teacher testing, inconsistency of standards within the same state for all levels of teacher certification, and the ease of obtaining an emergency certificate in times of teacher shortage (pp. 223-24).

The issue is not whether to assess, but how to assess, according to Wise and Darling-Hammond (1987). They state that in order to assure quality control of entrants, all professions have increased educational requirements and instituted "testing procedures designed to assure the public and themselves that new members are qualified to practice . . ." (p. 5). The issue for the teaching profession, according to the authors, is that states have not yet designed a viable process to assess teaching knowledge and skill. Thus far, states have relied:

> Either on multiple-choice, paper-and-pencil tests of professional knowledge or on-the-job assessments of performance . . . the former approach cannot adequately assess the ability of candidates to apply knowledge with sound judgment

> in nonroutine, complex teaching settings. The latter approach does not provide a comprehensive, fair, reliable, or generalizable assessment of teaching knowledge and skills (p. 6).

Multiple-choice tests, the authors state, "fail to represent the complexity of the decision-making process or the full range of the professional knowledge base" (p. 21). On-the-job assessment of performance is problematic because of the assumption that "there is a set of discrete teaching behaviors that can be observed on a few occasions in diverse classroom settings that are equally effective for all grade levels, subject areas, and students" (p. 25). This approach, state Wise and Darling-Hammond (1987), is not valid because researchers have concluded that "linking precise and specific teacher behavior to precise and specific learning of pupils . . . is not possible at this time (p. 26).

As with the teacher preparation area, activities at the national level, addressing the above-cited teacher assessment problems, are beginning to have an impact on state assessment policies. Originating with Lee Shulman and colleagues as part of the Teacher Assessment Project for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards—supported by the Carnegie Corporation—a movement is underway to develop a new generation of teacher assessments. According to Shulman (1987), the intent is to "expand the vision of those who design tests for teachers regarding the full range of possibilities available" (p. 38). Concurring with the criticisms of authors reviewed above, Shulman also disputes the validity of the two current types of assessments now used for teachers, multiple-choice examinations and direct observations of practice, which employ "what is almost invariably a global scale that ignores differences in context attributable to the subject matter being taught or the age or level of the learners" (pp. 38-39).

Prototypes being developed for the National Board will include, according to Shulman: written assessments, assessment center exercises, documentation of performance during supervised field experiences, and direct observation of practice by trained observers (p. 39). At least two states, California and Connecticut, are using the work Shulman and others have done for the National Board to develop "radically new approaches to defining standards and procedures for licensing teachers" (Shulman, 1987, p. 43).

In a similar vein, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) is overhauling the paper-and-pencil format of its widely used National Teacher Exams. The

new tests will include a third assessment phase, in addition to assessments of basic skills and subject matter. Stage III, according to ETS officials, will consist of a series of observations and evaluations focusing on knowledge application, assessing, for example, such skills as lesson planning, instruction, classroom management, student evaluation, and instructional effectiveness.

Teacher Supply and Demand

In their 1988 study, *The Evolution of Teacher Policy*, Darling-Hammond and Berry found that for every move to tighten teacher certification requirements, there was another to loosen or waive requirements to counteract teacher shortages (p. viii). Others who have observed trends in state policy-making for teacher certification agree. While praising the steps Virginia had taken to raise standards for entry into teaching, McNergney, Medley, and Caldwell (1988) state that the major threat to maintaining these standards is teacher supply. In the past, according to the authors, when teacher shortages occurred, certification standards were relaxed (p. 43). In their study of the effects of teacher testing, Wise et al. (1988) found that many states were hiring teachers on emergency certificates or pursuing alternative certification routes to counteract teacher shortages exacerbated by testing policies (p. 7).

Wise and Darling-Hammond (1987) discuss this cyclical force, which they attribute to the current standard-setting process for teaching. Lowering standards in times of teacher shortage, the authors believe, "can create long-term difficulties in maintaining a steady supply of qualified applicants" (p. 9):

> By lowering standards to satisfy immediate demand, states lower the status of the occupation and undermine market responses that would push salaries into equilibrium with market forces of supply and demand. In the long run, this depresses the supply of qualified applicants.
>
> Furthermore, a sustained period of trading off quality for quantity reduces the public's confidence in the competence of a professional and in the entire educational enterprise (p. 9).

Darling-Hammond (1989) proposes three solutions to this circular problem:

1. Because the state has a conflict of interest when it tries to set standards and ensure sufficient numbers of teachers, standards must be regulated by professionally controlled licensure and examination boards.

2. Current standards serve primarily political purposes; they sort, but do not define, the knowledge base for defensible practice. As such, they are seen by prospective teacher candidates as "too much hassle given the meagre pecuniary benefits associated with teaching" (p. 11). Creating meaningful standards that define what a prospective teacher ought to know and be able to do will increase the attraction to teaching of professionally oriented candidates who desire responsibility and autonomy.

3. To balance the requirements of supply and qualifications, a system should be designed that includes "differentiated roles and responsibilities" to accommodate classroom needs (p. 15). This system would assign roles and responsibilities according to the level of training and expertise demon strated by individuals desiring to work with school children.

Differentiated staffing among teachers is also a structure advocated by the Holmes Group. Its 1986 report, *Tommorow's Teachers*, calls for the training of two types of teachers: (1) the *career professional teacher*, who would "be capable of assuming not only full responsibility for the classroom but also for certain aspects of the administration of the school and even of the university, and (2) the *instructor*, a person whose ultimate career aspirations lie elsewhere, who "would teach under the supervision of a career professional" (Murray, 1986, p. 30).

In addition to the historical problem of setting standards to meet teacher supply needs, a new problem has emerged with the advent of the teacher competency assessment movement. That problem is the severe shortage of minority teacher candidates. A number of reasons are cited to explain the decline in minority teachers entering the teacher work force, including the ability of minorities to enter fields heretofore closed to them. However, policy analysts agree that testing policies have negatively impacted upon a disproportionate number of Black teacher candidates. This circumstance,

according to Darling-Hammond (1989), might be more readily accepted "if the tests were strong predictors of potential teaching effectiveness." However, "if nonvalid tests . . . are screening out large numbers of candidates on grounds other than teaching ability, [they] are imposing a number of social costs without attaining commensurate social benefits" (pp. 11-12).

Governing the Teaching Profession

How these issues will be resolved may well depend on the interplay of two concurrent movements that emerged during the past decade. The first is the regulation of teachers and teaching at the state level. The second is the development of teaching as a profession characterized by self-regulation and individual independence. The resolution of these two apparently contradictory trends is a difficult one for policymakers. As Darling-Hammond and Wise (Task Force on Teaching, 1986) note, deregulation "is risky for policymakers; it relies on people . . . and judgments. It places more weight on the development of client-responsive practices than on the definition of standardized practices" (p. 26).

In spite of the risks, some analysts argue, policymakers must re-examine how best to accomplish the state's educational goals. When states institute top-down prescriptive teaching policies, according to Sykes (Task Force on Teaching, 1986), "the routinization of instruction tends to deprofessionalize teaching and to further discourage capable people from entering the field" (p. 26). In addition, according to Darling-Hammond (1988a), when policymakers attempt to find one best system for all, many students "fall through the cracks." She asserts:

> We can no longer believe that one best system can be codified and packaged for rote administration by teachers . . . . If students are to be well taught, it will not be by virtue of bureaucratic mandate but by virtue of highly trained, well-supported professionals. . . (p. 12).

An alternative approach to increased state regulation, according to the 1986 Carnegie Forum report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, is to ensure the academic ability of teachers and quality teacher training, as well as establishing outcomes by which to measure success of individual schools (Task Force on Teaching As a Profession, 1986, p. 27).

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards serves as a national prototype for the teaching profession. The board's stated purpose is to "establish high and rigorous standards for what teachers should know and be able to do, which go beyond the minimum standards of state licensing systems for beginning teachers, and to certify those [practicing] teachers who meet those standards" (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, pp. 1- 3). Two-thirds of the board is composed of practicing teachers, while the remaining one-third is composed of public and other education members.

According to *Who Sets the Standards?*, a 1989 report of the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universties and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities, three states—California, Minnesota, and Oregon—have autonomous professional boards with full authority for establishing teacher education standards and monitoring teacher practices. Practicing teachers comprise the largest proportion of board members. Although the National Education Association has called for autonomous professional practices and standards boards for teachers since 1961, the movement has gained substantial credibility since the National Board was established.

This kind of self-regulation characterizes all professional occupations, according to Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988). Cremin (Darling-Hammond and Berry, 1988) explains the balance desired for the teaching profession:

> On the one hand, there is the prerogative of the public to set policy, determine direction, and fix support . . . . On the other hand, there is the prerogative of the teaching profession to govern its own work, set standards and determine the nature of the teaching practice. . . (p. 10).

Finn (1987) questions this strategy of "swapping control for results, in effect loosening the restrictions and allowing educators to conduct the schools . . . as they see fit . . ." (p. 313). "Deregulating education," he maintains, "means entrusting greater authority to the people and institutions whose lackluster performance triggered the excellence movement in the first place" (p. 314). Finn foresees those with vested interests in education taking over again for their own gain, while losing sight of the public interest. He summarizes this perceived dilemma by stating that:

> . . . the governors—and legislators and education-minded laypersons in general—are confronted by an authentic paradox: They cannot radically improve educational performance in their states . . . simply by adopting more rules for educators to obey. Yet deregulating the education enterprise may well be equivalent to . . . settling instead for marginal alterations of a familiar sort, most of them bearing a hefty price tag (p. 316).

Timar and Kirp (1988) describe the situation facing state policymakers in a similar manner:

> The dilemma for policymakers is that the most critical juncture of policy ends and means, the interaction between student and teacher, is the most difficult to regulate. If excellence is not wholly amenable to implementation by regulation, state policymakers must rely on promoting styles of professional judgment and the exercise of discretion, but in a manner consistent with policy goals (p. 6).

As indicated in the above review, the role of state policymakers in policies affecting education and teacher education has changed dramatically from what it was a decade ago. State policymakers have become involved in policy areas heretofore assumed to be the domain of local decision makers. In addition, policies have increasingly focused on outcomes rather than process, through the institutionalization of testing at all educational levels up to and including teacher testing.

Yet, also alluded to in the above review is the fact that, in spite of the deluge of policies enacted during the 1980s, policymakers are not satisfied with the results. Many speak now of returning decision-making responsibilties to local agencies and institutions. The overriding issue of the 1990s will be whether and how much control state-level policymakers will delegate to local decision makers, and the determining factor, it appears, will be instituting an accountability process that is satisfactory to both levels. The National Governors' Association report, *Results in Education: 1989*, acknowledges the difficulties inherent in developing a professional accountability system for student performance. A primary difficulty, according to the report, will be the task of balancing "flexibility and professional responsibility at the local level and the need for accountability" at the state level (p. 20).

As described above, Wise, Darling-Hammond, and other policy analysts have proposed that educators should be responsible for developing an accountability system that meets both professional and public policy needs.

The Future Role of the State in Educational Policymaking

As policymakers grapple with future needs for education, and educators seek to provide guidance on the best approaches to take to meet those needs, the following four tenets, derived from this review, might be useful guidelines:

1. There is a need for educators to take the lead in influencing these policies.

2. The reform agenda must be a broad, all-encompassing one, requiring sweeping changes in teaching conditions to accompany equally substantial changes in teacher preparation, assessment, and professional governance. This involves the use of the full range of policy instruments, described earlier using the McDonnell and Elmore (1987) typology—mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system changing. More important, according to McDonnell and Elmore, it involves understanding the assumptions underlying the use of particular policy instruments and the resulting consequences.

3. The rhetoric of policymakers must be equated with educational standards in order to develop and maintain public confidence in the educational system.

4. The role of state policymakers will continue to be central to educational policy-making during the next decade.

A Strong Role for Educators

Policy analysts argue that, in contrast to the first generation of educational reforms in the 1980s which took place without substantial educator involvement and support, educators must play a central role in the "second generation." As Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) point out:

> The next generation of reforms will need to focus on the content and nature of effective teaching, its assessment, and deployment within schools to ensure that long-range goals . . . are met. It is at this juncture that the involvement of the profession is critical, for state policy can constrain but not construct the conditions under which knowledge about teaching is produced, transmitted, and employed on behalf of . . . students . . . (p. xiv).

This new role for educators will also require that they acquire an awareness of the needs and concerns of policymakers that differ from those of the profession, such as competing needs for scarce financial resources and public resistance to taxes (Jefferson, 1988). It may behoove educators to establish programs that anticipate the needs of policymakers, states Williams (1988), "before lawmakers hand them a solution they find untenable" (p. 5). Further, according to Krotseng (1988), the institutional research community can "balance a heightened political presence . . . by identifying potential implications of proposed state policies from the outset and closely monitoring gubernatorial agendas" (p. 19).

Finally, as stated in the National Governors' Association report, *Time for Results* (1986), a new compact between teachers and the public must be designed wherein the "public must offer teachers a professional work environment and all that goes with it" [and] "teachers . . . must offer the public a commitment to the highest standards of professional competence . . . . They must work for results. . . not work to the rule" (pp. 8-9).

A Broad Reform Agenda

Many policy analysts would subscribe to Clark's and Astuto's (1988) contention that the current reform agenda is too narrow, too trivial to meet the needs of education today (p. 26). The National Governors' Association (1989) report, *Results in Education: 1989*, acknowledges that the piecemeal approach that has heretofore characterized educational reform will not work. The report concludes that systemic approaches are required (p. 12). Applying this belief specifically to teacher policy, Wise and Darling-Hammond (1987) maintain that only a total approach to reform to the profession will succeed in attracting and retaining qualified teachers—one that encompasses teacher preparation, assessment, and conditions of practice.

Achieving the goals of educational excellence proposed by state policymakers, conclude Timar and Kirp (1988), will necessitate "a policy transformation that is far more radical than anything dreamed thus far by the states" (p. 5). The authors fault reform efforts for targeting individuals—teachers, administrators, and counselors. "In the calculus of excellence, simply improving test scores, eliminating incompetent teachers from the classroom, and the like . . . will not promote the goal of educational excellence (p. 125). These reforms will achieve only marginal change, they maintain. Only total institutional change will achieve the macro results desired. Timar and Kirp describe reforms in the 1980s as primarily rhetorical in nature. According to Sizer (Timar and Kirp, 1988), these reforms were "accompanied only by predictable and modest, and thus unchallenging, remedies . . . . One sensed no new dreams, but a struggle to re-experience old ones" (p. xi).

Equating Rhetoric and Standards

Others agree with Timar and Kirp (1988) that the 1980s were high on rhetoric but low on substance where educational reform is concerned. For example, as noted earlier, Eissenberg and Rudner (1988) found a disjuncture between rhetoric and actual standards with regard to teacher testing that they believe could have serious implications for undermining public confidence.

The issue of how teacher supply and demand has affected standard setting for entry to the teaching occupation was discussed in the previous section. To counteract the effect of raising standards on teacher supply, policies raising teacher salaries and implementing incentives to enter teaching must be put into place. If policymakers create "meaningful standards for entry, inducements to enter teaching and teacher education, and differentiated staffing" in the short run, says Darling-Hammond (1989), "advances in the knowledge base and status of the professional will ameliorate the recurring shortages" in the long run (p. 15).

The Role of State Policymakers

State policymakers, particular governors, according to the National Governors' Association (1989), should continue their leadership role in educational reform efforts "because states have a constitutional responsibility for education" (p. 10). Finn (1987) concurs, saying that the "sustained gubernatorial interest in serious change is probably the best hope we have for significant education reform . . ." (p. 317).

The question to be resolved, however, according to Jordan (1988), is how the balance of power in relation to the control of teacher education and teaching policy will continue to shift in the next decade. As Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) explain:

> The current challenge is to determine which matters should be further refined through legislation and which should be left to local districts, schools, teachers, and professional bodies, and to find mechanisms for delegating them responsibly (p. xiv).

The proper role of the state, according to Timar and Kirp (1988), is to establish professional standards and expectations "and to nurture organizational characteristics that foster excellence" (p. 126). They continue:

> If states are serious about improving educational quality . . . they must create the appropriate context in which it can take place. That . . . will require fundamental redefinition of various organizational roles (p. 126).

The key is assigning the proper roles to the proper policy-making levels, Timar and Kirp (1988) contend:

> The states have the responsibility to establish clear expectations and a general educational framework. States provide the resources and create the context in which school can take shape (p. 135).
>
> . . . Just as states regulate the medical and legal professions without presuming to tell lawyers how many cases they need to win, or doctors what medication to prescribe to patients, states should regulate the teaching profession without intruding into the process of teaching (p. 126).

Summary

This paper has highlighted recent trends, issues, and research related to the roles and authority of states in policies for teachers and teaching. The topic is particularly relevant today given the fluctuation in who makes decisions that affect teachers and teaching, at what policy-making level these decisions are made, and what kinds of policy instrumentation is used to effect the desired changes.

The literature review has demonstrated an increased role for state policymakers in education decision making. Decisions that had typically been within the domain of professional educators are now subject to state mandate. While state-level scrutiny of education is not likely to diminish, there are trends suggesting that the types of decisions made at the state level are changing and that the role of local institutions is becoming increasingly important. Trends suggest that state policymakers will focus their attention more on educational outcomes and accountability systems and less on prescribing how education should be delivered.

The review has also demonstrated that, while there is major agreement between educators and policymakers that systemic changes in the education system are necessary, in contrast to the surface changes of earlier reform mandates, there is substantial disagreement on how such change will be achieved. Many education policy analysts cited in this review, such as Darling-Hammond, Sykes, Timar and Kirp, and Wise, would advocate a capacity-building approach to effecting changes in the education delivery system. They maintain that the failure of education reforms to date is due to the fact that teachers have not had the training or resources necessary to meet educational expectations.

Increasingly, however, many state policymakers are looking at system-changing policies rather than capacity-building strategies as the best method for effecting change. A prominent example of this approach is the advocacy of alternative teacher certification programs that bypass traditional education programs entirely. The roles and authority of state policymakers in policies for teachers and teaching will likely be determined in each state by the convergence of these two approaches in the next several years.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1988). *Teacher education policy in the states: A 50-state survey of legislative and administrative actions*. Washington, DC: Author.

Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities. (1989). *Who sets the standards?* Washington, DC: Author.

Cark, D. L. & Astuto, T. A. (1988). *Education policy after Reagan—What next?* Occasional paper No. 6. Charlottsville, VA: University Council for Educational Administration. ED 300 895

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988a). Accountability and teacher professionalism. *American Educator, 12*, 8-13.

_____. (1988b). Policy and professionalism. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building a professional culture m schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

_____. (1989). Teacher supply, demand, and standards. *Educational Policy* 3, 1-17.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Berry, B. (1988). The evolution of teacher policy. Washington, DC: The RAND Corporation.

Devaney, K., & Sykes, G. (1988). Making the case for professionalism. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Bu*ilding a professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Eissenberg, T. E., & Rudner, L. M. (1988). State testing of teachers: A summary. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 21-22.

Ellwein, M. C., Glass, G. V., & Smith, M. L. (1988). Standards of competence: Propositions on the nature of testing reforms. *Educational Research, 17*, 4-9.

Finn, C. E. (1987). Governing education. *Educational Policy, 1*, 303-319.

Firestone, W. A., Fuhrman, S. H., & Kirst, M. W. (1989). The progress of *reform: An appraisal of state education initiatives*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Futrell, M. H. (1989). Mission not accomplished: Education reform in retrospect. *Phi Delta Kappan 71*, 8-14.

Goodlad, 1. (1988). *The national network for educational renewal: Past, present, future*. Seattle, WA: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, University of Washington.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Jefferson, A. L. (1988). *An explanation of government response to educational demands*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. ED 294 470

Jordan, K. F. (1988). *State professional standards/practices commissions or boards: A policy analysis paper*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Krotseng, M. V. (1988). *Quality from state house to statistics: Linking "education governors" with institutional research*. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Phoenix, AZ. ED 298 872

McDonnell, L. M., & Elmore, R. F. (1987). Getting the job done: Alternative policy instruments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 9, 133- 152.

McNergney, R. F., Medley, D. M., & Caldwell, M. S. (1988). Making and implementing policy on teacher licensure. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 38-44.

Murray, F. B. (1986). Goals for the reform of teacher education: An executive summary of the Holmes Group report. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68, 28-32.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1988). Institutional mission. Washington, DC: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The *imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Author. ED 226 006

National Governors' Association. (1986). *Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education*. Washington, DC: Author.

_____. *(1989).Results in education:* 1989. *The governors' 1991 report on education*. Washington, DC: Author.

Scannell, M. M. *(1988). Factors influencing state policies restricting entry to teaching*. Unpublished doctural dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, DC.

Schalock, H. D. & Myton, D. V. *(1988)*. A new paradigm for teacher licensure: Oregon's demand for evidence of success in fostering learning. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 8-16.

Shive, J. J. (1988). Professional practices boards for teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 2-7.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Assessment for teaching: An initiative for the profession. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 69, 38-45.

Simms R. L., & Miller, J. R. (1988). Assault on teacher education in Texas. Journal of Teacher *Education*, 39, 17-20.

Spring, J. (*1988). Conflict of interests: The politics of American education*. New York: Longman.

Sykes, G. (1987). Reckoning with the spectre. *Educational Researcher*, 16, 19-21.

Task Force on Teaching. (1986). *Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education supporting works*. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A *nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Timar, T.B., & Kirp, D.L. (1988). *Managing educational excellence*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Tucker, M., & Mandel, D. (1986). The Carnegie report—A call for redesigning the schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68, 24-27.

Williams, J. (1988). *State-mandated English proficiency requirements for classroom instructors*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Chicago, IL.

Wise, A.E., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1987). *Licensing teachers: Design for a teaching profession*. Washington, DC: The RAND Corporation.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., & Purnell, S. (1988). *Impacts of teacher testing: State educational governance through standard-setting*. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.

Zeichner, K.M. (1988). *Understanding the character and quality of the academic and professional components of teacher education*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education. ED 301 537